

CHAS. GUNST INDICTED WITH LOVENSTEIN

Charged Jointly by Grand
Jury With Conspiracy
to Defraud City

CASE GOES TO POLICE COURT

Indictment Contains Three
Counts, Charge Being That
They Opened Wood Con-
tract Bids—Subcontract
Matter Is Con-
demned

Isadore Lovenstein, former Assistant Superintendent of the City Home, and Charles Gunst were jointly indicted on three counts by the grand jury in the District Court yesterday. Within an hour after the indictment was returned, a sum of \$500 each for bond in the case was set by the court. The case will be before Justice Crutchfield in the Police Court on Saturday, where the case will be tried. It is charged in the indictment that Lovenstein and Gunst conspired, first, to defraud the city, second, to defraud bidders, and third, to obtain the wood contract, amounting to about \$3,500, for Charles Gunst and the indictments, the grand jury charged that Lovenstein and Gunst conspired to defraud the city by dealing with conditions existing heretofore at the City Home, and (taking up specifically the matter of subcontracts for certain work at the Institution for the Deaf and Blind) that they conspired to defraud the city by the faultily work done by the city.

of municipal government, regarded by municipal experts as antiquated and cumbersome to a degree. Referring to the matter to which Dr. Ennion G. Williams called the attention of the committee the presentment says:

Must Amend Statutes.

"If the present statute does not prohibit a city official from entering into a transaction like the above, it permits him, by indirection, to do what it forbids him to do directly. Such an principle

may readily be more vicious in its results than no restriction at all." The grand jury urges that the "matter be called to the attention of the proper city representatives that they may take such steps as are necessary to have this statute amended and enlarged so as to fully and unequivocally cover such cases."

Grand Jury to Meet Again.

No names were mentioned. There were few persons in the courtroom when the jury filed in. Foreman E. L. Bemis read the presentment, after which he and his associates, who have

worked hard to unearth graft, were permitted to go until November 1st when they will assemble again to take up questions the nature of which were not made known.

Mr. Hiram Smith, of counsel for Lovenslein and Gunst, immediately got

In communication with them, and they went to Justice Crutchfield's office to give bond. The case will not be tried until Saturday, as Mr. Harry M. Smith, who represents the defendants, is busy in the Hechler trial in Henrico.

They Expect Acquittal.

Gunst and Lovenstein were apparently undisturbed by the indictments, expecting a prompt acquittal. In the grand jury room the benefit of the doubt is given the Commonwealth, and at the trial it is given the defendant. For this and other reasons many per-

sons familiar with the history of the case expressed the opinion that there would be no conviction. At all events, however, the charges recently preferred by Mr. Graham B. Hobson, and the subsequent statement of Dr. Williams, along with the presentment of the grand jury, will have a most wholesome effect.

Telling of Conditions.

Following is the full text of the grand jury's report:

Richmond, Va., October 31, 1907.
To the Honorable Judge of the
Hustings Court:
In examining into the charges
of wrongdoing in connection with

We have found much of this testimony built upon idle rumors, and springing from the propensity

Because we had to deal with conditions that have been the gradual growth of a number of years, the task has been hard and productive of scanty results of well defined character. Many things worthy of condemnation have insidiously established themselves and perhaps have come to be taken as matters of course. Under such circumstances we have experienced difficulty in fixing the

Found Evil Practices.
We have found reprehensible conditions and evil practices which we have sought to determine whether to be the

the results of the unlawful acts of one of more individuals or the consequence of a long period of lax and improvident administration.

In different measures we have found both factors operating.

At the outset, however, we desire to say that we have found nothing of intentional wrongdoing to be imputed

to Superintendent Davis. His responsibility chiefly lies in his failure to see and check petty wrongs he might have seen if he had kept more closely in touch with the details of the affairs

of the institution. To a great extent this failure is due to a system which requires him to spend one-half of each

We believe that the superintendent should be more immediately and constantly in charge of the institution; that his committee should give him ample authority and stronger support, and then hold him to a stricter personal responsibility for the operation of all departments of his institution.